

## Waste and duplicity in intelligence gathering?

# Former CIA 'spy' comes in from the cold—into hot water

By Joanne Leedom

Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

Boston

In the basement of his home in Oakton, Va., with dogs and children running havoc around him, Victor Marchetti wrote a spy novel last year. Today Mr. Marchetti and his new book "The Rope Dancer" are stirring up havoc of another kind just a few miles from his home, at Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) headquarters where Mr. Marchetti was an official just two years ago.

Today Mr. Marchetti is the spy "who came in from the cold—into hot water," to quote one of his friends. Now an outspoken critic of the agency, Mr. Marchetti has been traveling around the country promoting his exposé of the spy's world and crusading for reform in the CIA.

Mr. Marchetti left the CIA after a 14-year career in protest over what he asserts is its waste and duplicity in intelligence gathering, its increasing involvement with the military, its amorality, and what he says now is its subtle shifts to "domestic spying."

Reform, he says, in the entire intelligence network should be three-pronged: (1) reorganizing responsibilities, (2) reducing size ordered by President Nixon. Placing CIA director Richard Helms as overall coordinator of national intelligence recently was in part aimed at eliminating the waste in the nation's \$6 billion/200,000-man intelligence operation which spans a dozen governments and funding, and (3) exposing the intelligence community to more public control and scrutiny.

### Silence maintained

The CIA, in its turn, has remained customarily silent to the public attack. However, one former top CIA official, who asked to remain anonymous, agreed with some of Mr. Marchetti's points but disputed his main arguments.

Since Mr. Marchetti began speaking out several months ago, a major restructuring in the intelligence community has been on the agenda. It was also aimed at tailoring intelligence output more closely to White House needs.

This reform and Mr. Marchetti's own criticism come at a time when Congress, too, is demanding more knowledge and control over the intelligence networks. For the first time Congress has ordered public hearings on the CIA next year, and Mr. Marchetti plans to testify.

### Military influence

In Boston Mr. Marchetti explained his own "defection": "My discontent with the

agency was hard for me to identify at first. I began first to criticize the waste. This is ridiculous, I thought. We could be doing the job for \$2 billion less.

"The second thing that was most annoying to me was the military influence. This is very pervasive. When the Secretary of Defense controls 85 percent of the assets, he [the CIA director] doesn't have the muscle to make changes. The military influence in many ways is the greatest single factor of waste. They want to know more and more and are responsible for collection overkill."

To these two criticisms, the former CIA official who worked close to the director and who responded for The Christian Science Monitor, partly agreed. "There is unfortunately an awful lot of duplication," he said, but added, "What is needed is tighter control over the military [not the CIA]. It's not a question of the CIA duplicating the military, but of the military duplicating what the CIA does. The President's reorganization is a strong move in the right direction."

Another one of Mr. Marchetti's complaints is that the traditional intelligence work of gathering and assessing information has been "contaminated" with paramilitary activity.

A prime example is Laos where the CIA recruited and armed thousands of natives, says Mr. Marchetti, who worked in the CIA as an intelligence analyst, as special assistant to the chief of plans, programs, and budgets, to the executive director, and finally as executive assistant to the agency's deputy director.

"[At the time] perhaps a handful of key congressmen and senators might have known about this activity in Laos. The public knew nothing," he declared.

According to the former CIA administrator, however, paramilitary activity is shifting out of the CIA now and into the Army. "But in any case," he said, "the CIA doesn't decide on this activity; they are directed by the President and the National Security Council." If there is to be reform in the use of the CIA, he argues, it must come from the President's direction.

While Mr. Marchetti is highly critical of the CIA's paramilitary and clandestine interventions in other countries, he insists that the real threat of the CIA today is that it may "unleash" itself on this country.

### Concern noticed

"In recent years as domestic unrest increased, I've noticed the CIA is concerned about the FBI's apparent inability to handle subversion in this country. I think there's an effort to convince the nation that the CIA should get into domestic intelligence."

"Ridiculous," snapped the former CIA administrator, and left this charge at that. To reform the intelligence network, Mr. Marchetti says there should be a reorganization to limit the Defense Department to the routine intelligence needs of various departments — Army, Navy, etc.

"Then I'd put the National Security Agency under the control of the President and Congress," elaborated Mr. Marchetti. "Congress has very little knowledge about what goes on. The Pentagon papers and the way the Supreme Court acted strips away the shield intelligence has always had. We need to let a little sunshine in; that's the best safeguard."

### Laos example cited

The former administrator insists, however, that there are already adequate controls through special congressional committees which control appropriations and military affairs. "If you had the whole Congress and Senate debating these issues in executive session, you might as well do away with it [secret intelligence operations]. Inevitably there would be leaks."

"Of course there would be leaks," admitted Mr. Marchetti. "What I'm really saying is that in the final analysis if we made the President walk through it [his decision to use covert forces in foreign countries], the President would see it's all not worth it. Then if we deny ourselves these alternatives we'd have to act in a diplomatic fashion."